

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present amendments and following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11-13, and 18-20 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, and 14-17 were canceled previously. Claims 2, 4, and 11 are amended. Claim 20 is newly added. Support for the amendments to Claims 2, 4, and 11 and for newly added dependent Claim 20 can be found in Fig. 7 and in the published application in numbered paragraph [0044], for example. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11-13, 18, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Tonkin (U.S. Patent No. 6,134,568, herein “Tonkin”) in view of Murphy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,661,531, herein “Murphy”).

Regarding the rejection of Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11-13, 18, and 19 as obvious over Tonkin in view of Murphy, that rejection is respectfully traversed by the present response.

Amended independent Claim 2 recites, in part:

... said document supervisory client is configured to generate a user interface based on the one set of changed print condition settings, and the user interface displays print conditions that are impermissible with a visual indication that identifies the print conditions as impermissible.

Accordingly, the user interface displays print conditions that are impermissible in combination with a visual indication. The visual indication identifies the print conditions as impermissible.

One benefit of the above-noted feature is that it is possible for a user to determine what print condition settings are restricted from use, but that would be otherwise available if the user had selected certain print condition settings other than the ones selected.

In contrast, Tonkin is silent regarding identifying print conditions that are impermissible via a user interface. Rather, Tonkin displays an error message when a user

actually selects settings that are impermissible. Tonkin does not display these settings beforehand with a visual indication indicating that the settings are impermissible.

Murphy fails to remedy the deficiencies discussed above regarding Tonkin inasmuch as Murphy is silent regarding displaying impermissible conditions with an indication indicating that the conditions are impermissible. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that no reasonable combination of Tonkin and Murphy would include all of the features recited in amended independent Claim 2 or any of the claims depending therefrom.

Amended independent Claims 4 and 11 recite substantially similar features to those discussed above regarding amended independent Claim 2 and patentably distinguish over any proper combination of Tonkin and Murphy for at least the same reasons as amended independent Claim 2 does. The claims depending from either of amended independent Claims 4 and 11 also patentably distinguish over any reasonable combination of the cited references for at least the same reasons as the respective independent claims do.

Newly added independent Claim 21 further defines the visual indication recited in amended independent Claim 2 and further patentably distinguishes over any proper combination of Tonkin and Murphy for at least the same reasons as amended independent Claim 2 does.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Lee L. Stepina
Registration No. 56,837